

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, and 21-24 are amended.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

On pages 3 and 4, the Office Action objects to alleged informalities in claims 5, 8, 10, and 21 for the uses of the “greater than or equal to” operator (\geq). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 8, 10, and 21, as amended, comply with all applicable requirements. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 5, 8, 10, and 21 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 4-7, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-7, 11-15, 17, 19-21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,127,228 to Chang et al. (hereinafter “Chang”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites, in part, “in an active state the state retaining circuit utilizing a regular power supply and a standby power supply” (emphasis added). Claims 11 and 23 contain similar recitations. This subject

matter finds support in, for example, paragraph [0011] of the published version of the specification.

As set forth in paragraph [0011], a regular power supply VDD and a standby power supply VDD_STANDBY are provided to the state retaining circuit during an active state. In the transition from the active state to the standby state, the regular power supply is decreased to ground level while the standby power supply is maintained.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chang fails to disclose, teach, or suggest utilizing both the regular power supply and standby power supply during the active state. In contrast, the device in Chang uses only the main power source during normal operation of the device (i.e., when there is not a break in power caused by power failure in the main power source). The device in Chang uses the main power source during normal operation of the device and switches to the backup power source during a break caused by a power failure in the main power source. See Column 3, Lines 27-30.

Accordingly, Chang fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “in an active state the state retaining circuit utilizing a regular power supply and a standby power supply,” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 11 and 23. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are therefore allowable over Chang.

Claims 4-7 are allowable based at least on their dependencies from claim 1. Claims 12-15, 17, and 19-21 are allowable based at least on their dependencies from claim 11.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 11-15, 17, 19-21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 7, the Office Action rejects claims 2 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,333,671 to Roberts et al. (hereinafter "Roberts"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 24 depends from independent claim 23. These claims are therefore allowable based at least on their dependencies. Roberts fails to remedy the deficiencies of Chang described above in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 23.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the attorney overseeing the application file, Aaron Waxler, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-5256.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Terry W. Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

Date: March 24, 2009

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131
CUSTOMER NO.: 65913